

Application No. 10/813,974
Amendment Dated June 18, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated March 18, 2010

Remarks

Claims 1-42 are pending.

Claims 1-42 stand rejected

Claims 1, 21 and 39 have been amended.

Claims 1-42 are submitted herein for review.

No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has modified the previous prior art rejection and now rejects independent claims 1, 21 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the previously cited Schaffer (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,312) and Sonesh (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,762) in view of the newly cited Riskin (U.S. Patent No. 4,757,267).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and submit the following remarks in response.

The present invention as claimed in the independent claims is directed to a method for routing a directory assistance call from a wireless communications device to a directory assistance service having a plurality of geographically separate call centers.

The method includes receiving the call, having an associated communication device identifier unique to the caller's device, at a first directory assistance call center located at one geographic location, the call being routed to the first directory assistance call center based on the communications device identifier. The first directory assistance call center is designated to handle all calls having the communications device identifier regardless of the geographic location of the wireless communication device at the time of the call.

The actual geographic vicinity of the wireless communications device is determined at the first directory assistance call center at the time of the call. A second call center at a different geographic location closer to said vicinity of the wireless communications device is identified at the first directory assistance call center at the time of the call and the call is re-routed to a second directory assistance call center if that second directory assistance call center is closer to the geographic vicinity of the wireless communications device than the first directory assistance call center.

As per the claimed arrangement, an enhanced directory assistance service may employ a plurality of geographically separate call centers across the country as shown in Figure 1. In such enhanced director systems, each call center covers the geographic surrounding area so that directory calls from within their area are routed to them. This is primarily accomplished by an automatic routing system that uses a communication device identifier unique to the caller's device (eg. the caller's ANI) to estimate the caller's location and then route the call to the "home" (geographically closest) call center.

However, as noted in paragraph [0030] when a caller is travelling with mobile phone, their geographic location has changed even when their ANI has not. When they call the enhanced directory system, they are routed based on this unique communication device identifier (ANI) to the caller's home call center because, for that system, the first directory assistance call center is designated to handle *all calls having said communications device identifier* regardless of the geographic location of said wireless communication device at the time of said call.

In such a situation, the first call center may recognize that the caller's ANI is not indicative of their physical location based on some geographic location data embedded in

Application No. 10/813,974
Amendment Dated June 18, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated March 18, 2010

the call data, in which case the call is re-routed to a different one of the call centers that is geographically proximate to the caller *at the time of the call*.

This feature is not shown in any of the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

The cited Schaffer reference teaches a 1-800 routing system used when a user is desiring to purchase flowers locally using the nationally advertised toll free number (eg. 1-800-FLOWERS).

The Examiner asserts on page 4 of the Office Action, that:

“Shaffer clearly discloses the first call center handling all calls regardless of the location of the wireless communication device and re-routing the call to a second call center (Fig. 1c, Fig. 2, col. 15, line 60 through col. 16, line 8, i.e., the “1-800” number call center being the designated to handle all calls having said communication device identifier regardless of the location of said wireless communication device wherein the “1-800” number call center reads on “ the first call center handling all calls, and Fig. 27, Service location #1 150a, Service Location #2 150b, col. 39, lines 1-4, and col. 52 lines 2-6, wherein a servicing location telephone (e.g., at a service location 150a) reads on “a second call center”).”

Applicant acknowledges that this is what Shaffer teaches but this feature is not recited in the present independent claims.

As noted above, the system of the present claims ***do not route all calls to one first call center regardless of the location***. Rather the present claims recite that the call is initially routed to a first call center ***based on said communications device identifier***, the first directory assistance call center being designated to handle all calls ***having said communications device identifier*** regardless of the geographic location of said wireless communication device at the time of said call.

As noted in the prior Amendment, regarding the Sonesh reference, the Examiner

Application No. 10/813,974
Amendment Dated June 18, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated March 18, 2010

uses this reference to show the teaching that calls are routed to a first call center and then rerouted to a the second call center.

However, although Sonesh does teach a distributed call center with two or more call centers as per Figure 5, the cited portion does not teach that the first directory assistance call center is designated to handle *all calls having said communications device identifier* regardless of the location of said wireless communication device. Rather as noted in the prior a Amendment, in Sonesh it appears that a certain *type of calls* (multimedia calls), are routed to one of the call centers for possible re-routing. However, there is no suggestion that all calls from one *communications device identifier* are always routed to the first call center.

The Examiner on pages 5-6 notes that the new reference Riskin also teaches the common feature of a “first call center handling all calls regardless of the location of the wireless communication device and re-routing the call to a second call center...” as per columns 7 and 8.

However, like Shaffer, Riskin relates to a national 1-800 routing system, where calls placed to a 1-800 number are routed to a common LDC toll office 42 which in turn eventually gets the call to a geographically proximate call center/CDSC 20, 28, 30, 32, 34 and 40 (CDSC - customer /dealer service company).

Again, Applicant acknowledges that this is what Riskin teaches but this feature is not recited in the present independent claims.

As noted above, the system of the present claims *do not route all calls to one first call center regardless of the location*. Rather the present claims recite that the call is initially routed to a first call center *based on said communications device identifier*, the

Application No. 10/813,974
Amendment Dated June 18, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated March 18, 2010

first directory assistance call center being designated to handle all calls having said communications device identifier regardless of the geographic location of said wireless communication device at the time of said call.

In Riskin, there is no feature of a call being routed to a first call center based on the communications device identifier of the caller.

Applicants are aware that a § 103 rejection cannot be answered by addressing each of the references individually. However, none of the cited references teach or suggest the elements of the claims of the present application.

Even if the references were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting system and method would still not teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in either Shaffer, Sonesh or Riskin, either alone or in combination that discloses receiving the call, having an associated communication device identifier unique to the caller's device, at a first directory assistance call center located at one geographic location, the call being routed to the first directory assistance call center based on the communications device identifier. The first directory assistance call center is designated to handle all calls having the communications device identifier regardless of the geographic location of the wireless communication device at the time of the call.

Likewise, there is no teaching or suggestion in either Shaffer, Sonesh or Riskin that discloses that the call is re-routed to a second directory assistance call center if that second directory assistance call center is closer to the geographic vicinity of the wireless communications device than the first directory assistance call center.

As such, Applicants request that the rejections of independent claims 1, 21 and 39

Application No. 10/813,974
Amendment Dated June 18, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated March 18, 2010

be withdrawn. As dependent claims 2-20, 22-38 and 40-42 depend from independent claims 1, 21 and 39 Applicants request that the rejections be removed for at least the same reason.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance, the earliest possible notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner feels that an interview would facilitate the prosecution of this Application they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SOFER & HAROUN, L.L.P.

By: /Joseph Sofer/
Joseph Sofer
Reg. No 34,438
317 Madison Avenue
Suite 910
New York, NY 10017
(212) 697-2800
Customer # 39600

Dated: June 18, 2010